

made ineligible to hold office on the basis of unsupported allegations and that any rights guaranteed him by the constitution and bylaws are protected. Similarly, a union may require an elected officer to sign an affidavit averring that he is not barred from serving as an officer by the provisions of section 504 of the Act since the union and its officers may not permit a person to serve as an officer if he is so barred (see footnote 23).

(b) It would not violate the Act for a union to prohibit successive terms in office or to limit the number of years an officer may serve. Such rules are intended to encourage as many members as possible to seek positions of leadership in the organization.

§ 452.50 Disqualification as a result of disciplinary action.

Section 401(e) was not intended to limit the right of a labor organization to take disciplinary action against members guilty of misconduct. So long as such action is conducted in accordance with section 101(a)(5), a union may, for example, if its constitution and bylaws so provide, bar from office for a period of time any member who is guilty of specific acts, such as strike-breaking, detrimental to the union as an institution. However, if a union has improperly disciplined a member and barred him from candidacy, the Secretary may, in an appropriate case, treat him as a member in good standing entitled to all of the rights of members guaranteed by title IV.

§ 452.51 Declaration of candidacy.

A union may not adopt rules which in their effect discourage or paralyze any opposition to the incumbent officers. Therefore, it would not be a reasonable qualification to require members to file a declaration of candidacy several months in advance of the nomination meeting since such a requirement would have such effect and "serves no reasonable purpose which cannot otherwise be satisfied without resort to this procedure."³¹

³¹ *Wirtz v. Local 30, IUOE*, 242 F. Supp. 631 (S.D. N.Y. 1965) reversed as moot 366 F.2d 438 (C.A. 2, 1966), reh. den. 366 F.2d 438.

§ 452.52 Filing fee.

It would be unreasonable to require candidates for office to pay a filing fee because a fee limits the right of members to a reasonable opportunity to nominate the candidates of their choice and there is no objective relationship between the requirement and the ability to perform the duties of the office.

§ 452.53 Application of qualifications for office.

Qualifications for office which may seem reasonable on their face may not be proper if they are applied in an unreasonable manner or if they are not applied in a uniform way. An essential element of reasonableness is adequate advance notice to the membership of the precise terms of the requirement. A qualification which is not part of the constitution and bylaws or other duly enacted rules of the organization may not be the basis for denial of the right to run for office, unless required by Federal or State law.³² Qualifications must be specific and objective. They must contain specific standards of eligibility by which any member can determine in advance whether or not he is qualified to be a candidate. For example, a constitutional provision which states that "a candidate shall not be eligible to run for office who intends to use his office as a cloak to effect purposes inimical to the scope and policies of the union" would not be a reasonable qualification within the meaning of section 401(e) because it is so general as to preclude a candidate from ascertaining whether he is eligible and would permit determinations of eligibility based on subjective judgments. Further, such a requirement is by its nature not capable of being uniformly imposed as required by section 401(e).

§ 452.54 Retroactive rules.

(a) The reasonableness of applying a newly adopted restriction on candidacy

³² *Wirtz v. Local Union 559, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America*, 61 LRRM 2618, 53 L.C. ¶11.044 (W.D. Ky. 1966); *Hodgson v. Longshoremen's Local 1655 New Orleans Dray Clerks*, 79 LRRM 2893, 67 L.C. ¶12.466 (E.D. La. January 5, 1972).

retroactively depends in part upon the nature of the requirement. It would be unreasonable for a labor organization to enforce eligibility requirements which the members had no opportunity to satisfy. For example, it would not be reasonable for a union to apply a newly adopted meeting attendance requirement retroactively since members would have no opportunity to comply with such requirement prior to its effective date.³³ When such a rule is in effect the membership is entitled to advance notice of the requirements of the rule and of the means to be used in verifying attendance. It would not be unreasonable, however, for a union to adopt and enforce a rule disqualifying persons convicted of a felony from being candidates or holding office.

(b) It would not be proper for a labor organization to amend its constitution after an election to make eligible a person who had been elected but who was not eligible at the time of the election.

Subpart F—Nominations for Office

§ 452.55 Statutory provisions concerning nomination.

In elections subject to the provisions of title IV a reasonable opportunity must be afforded for the nomination of candidates. Although the Act does not prescribe particular forms of nomination procedures, it does require that the procedures employed be reasonable and that they conform to the provisions of the labor organization's constitution and bylaws insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of title IV.

§ 452.56 Notice.

(a) To meet this requirement, the labor organization must give timely notice reasonably calculated to inform all members of the offices to be filled in the election as well as the time, place, and form for submitting nominations. Such notice should be distinguished from the notice of election, discussed in § 452.99. Notice of nominations need not necessarily be given at

least 15 days before nominations are held, nor is it required to be given by mail. In an election which is to be held by secret ballot, accordingly, notice of nominations may be given in any manner reasonably calculated to reach all members in good standing and in sufficient time to permit such members to nominate the candidates of their choice, so long as it is in accordance with the provisions of the labor organization's constitution or bylaws. Mailing such notice to the last known address of each member within a reasonable time prior to the date for making nominations would satisfy this requirement. Likewise, timely publication in the union newspaper with sufficient prominence to be seen by all members would be adequate notice. The method of making nominations, whether by mail, petition, or at meetings, could affect the determination of the timeliness of the notice. The nomination notice may be combined with the election notice if the requirements of both are met. Posting of a nomination notice may satisfy the requirement of a reasonable opportunity for making nominations if such posting is reasonably calculated to inform all members in good standing in sufficient time to permit such members to nominate the candidates of their choice.

(b) The requirement of a reasonable opportunity for the nomination of candidates has been met only when the members of a labor organization are fully informed of the proper method of making such nominations.

§ 452.57 Procedures for nomination.

(a) Since the Act does not prescribe particular procedures for the nomination of candidates, the labor organization is free to employ any method that will provide a reasonable opportunity for making nominations. There are various methods which, if properly and fairly employed, would be considered reasonable under the Act. For example, nominations may be by petition, or from the floor at a nomination meeting.

(b) Whether a particular procedure is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the Act is a question which will depend upon the particular facts in each case. While a particular procedure may

³³ *Hodgson v. Longshoremen's Local 1655, New Orleans Dray Clerks*, 79 LRRM 2893, 67 L.C. ¶12,466 (E.D. La. January 5, 1972)